
2003-2004 *No Child Left Behind*—Blue Ribbon Schools Program
Cover SheetName of Principal Mrs. Christina Small
(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., Other) (As it should appear in the official records)Official School Name Liholiho Elementary School
(As it should appear in the official records)School Mailing Address 3430 Maunaloa Ave.
(If address is P.O. Box, also include street address)Honolulu, Hawaii 96816-2138
City State Zip Code+4 (9 digits total)

Tel. (808) 733-4850 Fax (808) 733-4856

Website/URL liholiho.k12.hi.us E-mail Christina_small@notes.k12.hi.us

I have reviewed the information in this application, including the eligibility requirements on page 2, and certify that to the best of my knowledge all information is accurate.

(Principal's Signature) Date _____Name of Superintendent Ms. Pat Hamamoto
(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., Other)

District Name _____ Tel. () _____

I have reviewed the information in this application, including the eligibility requirements on page 2, and certify that to the best of my knowledge it is accurate.

(Superintendent's Signature) Date _____Name of School Board
President/Chairperson Mr. Breene Harimoto
(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., Other)

I have reviewed the information in this package, including the eligibility requirements on page 2, and certify that to the best of my knowledge it is accurate.

(School Board President's/Chairperson's Signature) Date _____

PART I - ELIGIBILITY CERTIFICATION

The signatures on the first page of this application certify that each of the statements below concerning the school's eligibility and compliance with U.S. Department of Education, Office of Civil Rights (OCR) requirements is true and correct.

1. The school has some configuration that includes grades K-12. (Schools with one principal, even K-12 schools, must apply as an entire school.)
2. The school has not been in school improvement status or been identified by the state as "persistently dangerous" within the last two years. To meet final eligibility, the school must meet the state's adequate yearly progress requirement in the 2003-2004 school year.
3. If the school includes grades 7 or higher, it has foreign language as a part of its core curriculum.
4. The school has been in existence for five full years, that is, from at least September 1998.
5. The nominated school or district is not refusing the OCR access to information necessary to investigate a civil rights complaint or to conduct a district-wide compliance review.
6. The OCR has not issued a violation letter of findings to the school district concluding that the nominated school or the district as a whole has violated one or more of the civil rights statutes. A violation letter of findings will not be considered outstanding if the OCR has accepted a corrective action plan from the district to remedy the violation.
7. The U.S. Department of Justice does not have a pending suit alleging that the nominated school, or the school district as a whole, has violated one or more of the civil rights statutes or the Constitution's equal protection clause.
8. There are no findings of violations of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in a U.S. Department of Education monitoring report that apply to the school or school district in question; or if there are such findings, the state or district has corrected, or agreed to correct, the findings.

PART II - DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

1. Number of schools in the district: 174 Elementary schools
 37 Middle schools
 None Junior high schools
 35 High schools
 35 Other (Charter Schools)
 281 TOTAL

2. District Per Pupil Expenditure: \$8,375.

Average State Per Pupil Expenditure: \$8,375.

3. Category that best describes the area where the school is located:

- ☒ Urban or large central city
☐ Suburban school with characteristics typical of an urban area
☐ Suburban
☐ Small city or town in a rural area
☐ Rural

4. 11 years Number of years the principal has been in her/his position at this school.

N/A If fewer than three years, how long was the previous principal at this school?

5. Number of students enrolled at each grade level or its equivalent in applying school:

| Grade | # of Males | # of Females | Grade Total | | Grade | # of Males | # of Females | Grade Total |
|----------|------------|--------------|--|--|-------------------|---------------|--------------|-------------|
| K | 26 | 21 | 47 | | 7 | | | |
| 1 | 20 | 22 | 42 | | 8 | | | |
| 2 | 11 | 30 | 41 | | 9 | | | |
| 3 | 26 | 20 | 46 | | 10 | | | |
| 4 | 40 | 23 | 63 | | 11 | | | |
| 5 | 32 | 35 | 67 | | 12 | | | |
| 6 | 9 | 16 | 25 | | Other *Special | 4 Ed. Pre- | 4 School | 8 |
| | | | TOTAL STUDENTS IN THE APPLYING SCHOOL → | | | | | 339 |

6. Racial/ethnic composition of the students in the school: .05 % White
 .005 % Black or African American
 .02 % Hispanic or Latino
 99.925 % Asian/Pacific Islander
 0 % American Indian/Alaskan Native
 100% Total

7. Student turnover, or mobility rate, during the past year: 13 %
(This rate includes the total number of students who transferred to or from different schools between October 1 and the end of the school year, divided by the total number of students in the school as of October 1, multiplied by 100.)

| | | |
|-----|--|------|
| (1) | Number of students who transferred <i>to</i> the school after October 1 until the end of the year. | 23 |
| (2) | Number of students who transferred <i>from</i> the school after October 1 until the end of the year. | 18 |
| (3) | Subtotal of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)] | 41 |
| (4) | Total number of students in the school as of October 1 | 326 |
| (5) | Subtotal in row (3) divided by total in row (4) | 0.13 |
| (6) | Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100 | 13 |

8. Limited English Proficient students in the school: 5 %
16 Total Number Limited English Proficient

Number of languages represented: 9.

Specify languages: Cantonese, Japanese, Korean, Mandarin, Vietnamese, Taiwanese, Tagalog, Micronesian, Spanish,

9. Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals: 32.2 %

109 Total Number Students Who Qualify

If this method does not produce a reasonably accurate estimate of the percentage of students from low-income families or the school does not participate in the federally-supported lunch program, specify a more accurate estimate, tell why the school chose it, and explain how it arrived at this estimate.

10. Students receiving special education services: 12.4 %
42 Total Number of Students Served

Indicate below the number of students with disabilities according to conditions designated in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| <u>19</u> Developmentally Delayed | <u>2</u> Emotionally Disturbed |
| <u>1</u> Autism | <u>0</u> Orthopedic Impairment |
| <u>0</u> Deafness | <u>4</u> Other Health Impaired |
| <u>0</u> Deaf-Blindness | <u>13</u> Specific Learning Disability |
| <u>0</u> Hearing Impairment | <u>2</u> Speech or Language Impairment |
| <u>1</u> Mental Retardation | <u>0</u> Traumatic Brain Injury |
| <u>0</u> Multiple Disabilities | <u>0</u> Visual Impairment Including Blindness |

11. Indicate number of full-time and part-time staff members in each of the categories below:

Number of Staff

| | <u>Full-time</u> | <u>Part-Time</u> |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| Administrator(s) | <u>1</u> | <u> </u> |
| Classroom teachers | <u>18</u> | <u>7</u> |
| Special resource teachers/specialists | <u>5</u> | <u> </u> |
| Paraprofessionals | <u>5</u> | <u>2</u> |
| Support staff | <u>4</u> | <u>6</u> |
| Total number | <u>33</u> | <u>15</u> |

12. Average school student-“classroom teacher” ratio: **22:1** **Grades K-2**
25:1 **Grades 3-6**
13. Show the attendance patterns of teachers and students as a percentage. The student dropout rate is defined by the state. The student drop-off rate is the difference between the number of entering students and the number of exiting students from the same cohort. (From the same cohort, subtract the number of exiting students from the number of entering students; divide that number by the number of entering students; multiply by 100 to get the percentage drop-off rate.) Briefly explain in 100 words or fewer any major discrepancy between the dropout rate and the drop-off rate. (Only middle and high schools need to supply dropout rates and only high schools need to supply drop-off rates.)

| | 2002-2003 | 2001-2002 | 2000-2001 | 1999-2000 | 1998-1999 |
|--------------------------|--------------|--------------------------|--------------|---------------------------|--------------|
| Daily student attendance | <u>96.5%</u> | <u>96.5%</u> | <u>96.1%</u> | <u>96.0%</u> | <u>95.7%</u> |
| Daily teacher attendance | <u>99.0%</u> | <u>99.0%</u> | <u>99.0%</u> | <u>99.0%</u> | <u>99.0%</u> |
| Teacher turnover rate | <u>0%</u> | <u>.08%</u> 2 retired | <u>0%</u> | <u>.04%</u> 1 transfer | <u>0%</u> |
| Student dropout rate | <u>N/A</u> | <u>N/A</u> | <u>N/A</u> | <u>N/A</u> | <u>N/A</u> |
| Student drop-off rate | <u>N/A</u> | <u>N/A</u> | <u>N/A</u> | <u>N/A</u> | <u>N/A</u> |

PART III – SUMMARY

Our vision, “**Liholiho Elementary...A Community of Caring, Competent and Creative Learners**”, captures the essence of our school. Educational opportunities are provided for all children regardless of race, sex, creed or ability. Our mission is “to support our vision by conducting research, encouraging communication and developing resources.”

Liholiho Elementary was established in urban Honolulu in 1926. A significant increase of disadvantaged students entered our school within the past ten years. Students participating in our Free/Reduced Meal Program, increased from 24%(1992) to 32.3%(2003). In 2003, our fifth grader students met the Title I criteria of 40% receiving free/reduced meals. Forty-five percent of our students attend on Geographic Exceptions, residing outside our school boundaries. Our Special Education enrollment (12.4%) has tripled and our English Second Language Learner Program enrollment has doubled over the past decade. More than twelve diverse cultures exist within our 99.9% Asian/Pacific Islander population, each having different cultural values.

Our local governance body, School/Community-Based Management Council (SCBM) established a collaborative, continuous school improvement process, to address the growing needs of our student population. The SCBM Council is comprised of six role groups: Parents, Community, Students, Teachers, Classified Support Staff and Administration.

SCBM school teams analyzed Hawaii State Assessment reading and math data to identify specific needs. School-wide Learner Outcomes (SLOs) and a Standards Implementation Design (SID) Action Plan were developed. Instructional practices were aligned with national standards and the Hawaii Content and Performance Standards. Curriculum was redesigned to be more challenging and relevant. Our Parent-Teacher Association, Parent Community Network Center Facilitator (PCNC) Program and SCBM Council coordinated efforts to involve parents and the community in our school improvement process.

A Comprehensive Student Support System (CSSS) was established, to provide academic and social support programs for students. Programs were developed or adopted. Reading intervention programs were established for kindergarten through sixth grade students (Early Literacy Program, Primary Tutoring Program). The Positive Behavioral Support System (PBS) and a Character Education Program (TRIBES) were systematized to provide additional social support for our students. A partnership, the Elementary School Attendance Program (ESAP) was formed between Hawaii’s National Guard, the Honolulu Police Department and our school, to increase student attendance.

A pro-active team of teachers, a counselor, a psychologist, educational aides, a social worker and student services coordinator work with the administrator, parents and students to promote student success via our Primary School Adjustment Program (PSAP). Our PSAP program has been nominated by our school district for national recognition.

Hawaii State Assessment results indicate our school has been successful in meeting the diverse needs of our students, particularly our disadvantaged population. Increases in our Hawaii State Assessment reading and math scores for all students and subgroups (See Pages 16-19), provide evidence our students are succeeding. Liholiho Elementary School ranks in the top academic 5% of Hawaii’s schools. We were identified as a Department of Education SAT9 Honor Roll School, for continual high achievement in reading and math. Other honors include: Five years of sustained high scores in the School Inspection Program and recognition from the Hawaii Medical Service Association for an exemplary Drug Free Schools Program.

PART IV – INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC SUCCESS

Reading and Math Assessment Results

Annual Grade 3 and 5 Hawaii State Assessment data is utilized to identify needs and to guide curriculum and instruction. The Hawaii State Assessment consists of the (norm-reference) SAT Abbreviated Reading and Math Tests and the (criterion-reference) Hawaii Content and Performance Standards-Based Assessment. Hawaii's Annual Yearly Progress (AYP) benchmarks are used as guides to meet the No Child Left Behind requirements.

Liholiho Elementary School was ranked fifteenth in the state, based on the Hawaii State Assessment reading and math scores, thus placing the school in the top academic 5% of Hawaii public schools. Students in Grades 3 and 5 had an average of 66% Meeting/Exceeding Proficiency in Reading and Writing, and 38% Meeting/Exceeding Proficiency in Math. These scores improved significantly over the previous year's scores with an average increase of 13% in Grades 3 and 5 students Meeting/Exceeding Proficiency in Reading, and an average increase of 15% in Grades 3 and 5 students Meeting/Exceeding Proficiency in Math (See Pages 16-19). The Department of Education identified Liholiho as "Exemplary" in overall status. The school was "Academically Exemplary" with 100% of the Annual Yearly Progress targets met. Hawaii's Department of Education developed the targets and indicators to meet No Child Left Behind requirements.

Strengthening our Early Intervention Literacy Program is a part of our SID Action Plan. The school adopted the Metropolitan Reading Test (MRT) to assess the effectiveness of the program. Students entering our Kindergarten program are administered a Pre (Fall) and Post (Spring) Metropolitan Reading Test. Pre-test MRT data is used to identify students requiring additional assistance in reading and math. For the past four years, our pre-test data show an increasing number of Kindergarten students entering our school with below average scores in all sub-tests (Beginning Reading Skills, Story Comprehension Skills and Quantitative Math Skills Measurements). Spring post-test data consistently show 99% of students tested, gain significantly in all sub-tests.

Prior to the development of the current Hawaii State Assessment, Hawaii's Department of Education administered the SAT9 reading and math tests to all third and fifth grade students. An agency was contracted to longitudinally track the SAT9 reading and math scores. Third grade students were longitudinally followed through fifth grade. The growth curve and results were excellent, with increases in students scoring in the average and high stanines and decreases in lower stanines in reading and math. The school was honored as a Department of Education SAT9 Honor Roll School. To achieve this honor, 77% of a school's student population in Grades 3 and 5, had to score above national stanine scores in reading, open-ended reading and math. Students in both Grades 3 and 5 scored above national norms in all three areas for four consecutive years.

Our school developed the Liholiho Reading Assessment (LRA) as part of a reading assessment grant we received. The LRA is a formative classroom assessment tool that has been used and refined over the past four years. It assesses each student's reading comprehension ability using selected reading passages and running records. This formative measure enables teachers to identify student needs and adjust instruction to enable the student to meet success.

Assessment Data and School Improvement

A continuous cycle of school improvement, based on needs assessment and focused on student achievement, is well established. Annual Hawaii State Assessment data is disaggregated by gender, ethnicity and disability. Modifications to our Standards Implementation Design (SID) Action Plan and curriculum are made as new assessment data is received and analyzed. Thus, a continuous cycle of school improvement is generated, to enable our students to move to higher proficiency levels.

Teachers utilize individual and grade level data to modify and improve instruction to meet student and class needs. School-wide data is utilized to determine whether the school is successfully providing a coherent and relevant standards-based curriculum for our students. School Quality Survey results and our School Status and Improvement Report also provide pertinent information regarding school climate and parent, student and teacher perceptions about our school

Strengthening our students' reading, writing and math skills via a meaningful and rigorous curriculum is a primary focus of our SID Action Plan. Collaborative SCBM role group teams identify research-based instructional strategies and programs to meet national and state standards. Personnel, funding resources and staff development training are identified to support implementation of our plan.

Our SCBM Council monitors the implementation of our SID Action Plan. Team meetings are held monthly. The Council assesses the effectiveness of the plan and ensures it is congruent with the profile, vision and mission of our school.

Communication

Communication is critical to creating a sense of community. It begins in our classrooms as all teachers keep parents informed via regular class newsletters. School information is shared through our monthly school newsletters sent to parents, the Board of Education, Community Neighborhood Boards, Legislators and other schools. School-wide assessment and student work is showcased on the office, cafeteria and library/community bulletin boards, situated along walkways. Hawaii State Assessment and school level test results are shared at joint SCBM/PTA meetings.

Our PCNC Facilitator coordinates regular parent workshops, including an annual Hawaii State Assessment Night. The workshop enables our parents to understand the general content and components of the Hawaii State Assessment. Teachers and PCNC coordinate workshops to help parents understand state standards and student performance expectations. Student works that approach, meet or exceeds standards are exhibited at Science and Literacy Nights. In addition, student performances (drama, choral reading, poetry, dance) are showcased at our Fine Arts Night.

Student led Parent Teacher Conferences are held annually. At this time, parents receive a copy of their child's Hawaii State Assessment results and view their child's portfolios

Current Hawaii State Assessment data, School Quality Survey results, and the School Status and Improvement Report are available for viewing on the Department of Education's website. Our PTA and school maintain websites and share information about our school policies, student handbook, programs and activities. Student projects are also posted on the school website

Sharing Successes

Technology has widened our ability to share school successes. Access to our school, DOE and Liholiho PTA websites via the Internet, provides information to other schools in our state and nation.

The Department of Education shares school successes via a published statewide newsletter, distributed to each school employee. The public has access to these publications. Monthly school newsletters are distributed to other schools in our community area.

Formal sharing occurs between schools at joint staff development workshops and conferences. Liholiho Elementary teachers have been speakers at these workshop sessions and at educational conferences. Informal sharing between schools also occurs during meetings, workshops and conferences. Teachers share successes at regularly scheduled Gifted and Talented, Technology and CSSS Complex Area meetings. Monthly Principal meetings provide opportunities to network, share and articulate successes with other schools.

Partnerships have formed with other elementary schools. Visitations between schools culminate in articulation and sharing sessions between visiting staff and our teachers. Teachers utilize the DOE email system after the visitations to continue to share ideas and materials.

Our school utilizes closed-circuit broadcasts and multi-media student work to showcase our

successes. A library of video and multi-media projects has been developed. Interested individuals have access to the student made tapes and CDs. Teachers have visited our multi-media lab from other schools.

PART V – CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

Liholiho Elementary School utilizes the Hawaii Content and Performance Standards (state standards reflecting national content standards) and the State Standards Toolkit as guides to address all curricular areas. Teachers using school and state assessment data craft instructional activities and materials. This data and results driven process is the core of all our curriculum improvement efforts.

Language Arts

Liholiho Elementary School's Language Arts curriculum is based on effective instructional practices and the Hawaii's Language Arts Standards (reading, writing and oral communication). Teachers worked with District and State Specialists to align our Liholiho Literacy Model with state standards. Clear expectations of concepts and skills for grade level clusters were shared. Performance standards, reflecting high and challenging expectations and performance indicators were developed

"Every child will become a proficient reader and writer by the end of third grade" is a goal of the Department of Education. Thus, the early identification of students with reading needs was deemed essential. Early intervention programs were strengthened. Part-time teachers and tutors were assigned to help struggling readers. Effective reading strategies to develop phonemic awareness, decoding, word recognition and reading comprehension skills were identified. Funding was allocated to purchase reading literature and material that were rich in text, challenging and congruent with state standards.

Science/Social Studies

Teachers worked diligently with the State Science Specialist to align our spiraled Science curriculum with state and national standards. Students engage in project-based learning. Funding was provided to enable teachers to select kits and texts, which best met the Science Standards.

Science and Social Studies concepts are integrated with the Language Arts area of reading, writing and oral communication. An inquiry process and the use of higher level thinking skills permeate our curriculum.

Math

Teachers analyzed data from the 2003 Hawaii State Assessment and identified math as a focus area in our current SID. Although our students met the Annual Yearly Progress benchmark, data indicated our students had difficulty explaining how they solved math problems. To address this issue, our teachers developed criteria and a process for students to utilize in math. The process, **KWS-CHECK** (Know, Want to Know, Strategy Used, Recheck) helps students to explain how solutions to math problems are generated.

State standards are being used to refine our math curriculum. Currently, teachers are evaluating Math materials, texts and programs, which align with research based practices and Math Standards.

Fine Arts/Physical Education

Hawaii Content and Performance Fine Arts and Physical Education Standards are utilized as the basis of our Art, Music and P.E. curriculum. Specific skills for grade level clusters are addressed in these state standards. The Fine Arts are integrated with other content areas. Programs are supported through an Artist in the Schools Grant. Access to drama, poetry, writing, ceramics, weaving, batik and other classes have been provided. Our Physical Education specialist inservices teachers on Health and P.E. Standards.

World Language

Our Kindergarten through Sixth Grade students learn two world languages, Hawaiian and Japanese. World Language Standards are used as instructional guides to develop activity-based learning. Students learn about the culture, the music and dance, as well as the language. Our instructors attend workshops offered by World Language Specialists.

Educational Technology

Educational Technology Standards are incorporated in our computer teacher's instructional lessons. The technology teacher collaborates with classroom teachers to incorporate standards-based units in our students' technology projects. Students showcase their projects on class websites.

Reading Curriculum

The Liholiho Elementary School Literacy Model is based on a Hawaii Literacy Model and is aligned with the state's Language Arts Standards. The model uses research-based effective instructional strategies as a foundation for concept and content integration. It was refined with assistance from literacy specialists to include a reading comprehension assessment, Liholiho Reading Assessment (LRA).

Teachers model the use of these strategies during instruction and teach students to utilize the strategies to read literature and texts across content areas. Our intent is to "empower" students to be able to read any text or material by utilizing decoding, word reading and reading comprehension strategies. Students were taught strategies to increase their understanding of main idea, cause and effect, comprehension, prediction/validation, closure, mature reading strategies, divergent and inferential thinking processes. Vocabulary building strategies were utilized.

A variety of visual structures were presented to enable students to organize and link ideas and concepts. Graphic organizers were posted on bulletin boards as visual cues.

Funding and personnel resources were allocated to support our curriculum improvement efforts. Our teachers attended reading and writing staff development sessions. During the sessions, teachers shared student work and collaborated in grade level clusters to identify effective reading strategies and develop clear performance indicators and rubrics.

Curriculum Area-Science

Liholiho Elementary School restructured our Science curriculum and aligned it with the State and National Science Standards. Our school was a forerunner in aligning our curriculum with the Hawaii Content and Performance Standards.

The faculty worked in grade level clusters to adjust the content based upon the Science Standards. Areas were strengthened and inappropriate areas were eliminated. Information was shared to enable all students to experience continuity in content and teaching methodology.

Standards-based Science lessons were developed. Our school developed common expectations for quality student work, which met Standards. Scientific inquiry was viewed as an essential process skill. Students shared their projects with their parents through showcased events. Criteria for student work meeting Science Standards were shared.

Analysis of SAT9 Science data led our teachers to conclude that critical thinking is the key factor in learning. Being more cognizant of what is important for students to learn enables our school to continue to improve. Improvement efforts in Science are congruent with our school's vision of being a caring, competent and creative learner. Literacy and NCLB is definitely being addressed in our varied, integrated curriculum.

A core team continues to serve as a resource for the State and recently field-tested a new elementary science curriculum for them.

Instructional Methods

We believe the teacher is the key to higher student achievement. Thus, increasing teacher effectiveness is a school priority. Student learning is optimal in a positive classroom environment. Our school adopted a Character Education model (TRIBES), that builds community and inclusion within the classroom.

Expanding our teachers' repertoire of effective instructional methods is in our SID Action Plan. Teachers use reading and thinking strategies across curricular content areas (Science and Social Studies).

We developed performance indicators and rubrics to make our standards-based curriculum clear to students.

To improve student learning, research-based strategies are employed to integrate reading and writing (Language Arts Standards) across curricular areas. Direct instruction, vocabulary expansion, utilizing prior knowledge, visualization, prediction/validation, KWL process (Know, Want to know, Learn), Math-KWS check (Know, Want to Know, Strategy, Check), divergent and inferential thinking strategies, inquiry-based learning and self-questioning are key instructional strategies used by our teachers.

Specific reading processes to construct meaning are taught. Language Arts specialists worked with our teachers to embed effective reading strategies in Liholiho's Literacy Model. A steady increase in our reading achievement data is attributed to the use of the strategies listed below:

Phonemic awareness, decoding skills, VRIMM (Visualize, Retell and Paraphrase, Integrate Learning), Mature Reader Process (Make the Thinking Process Visible) for reading comprehension, cause and effect, main idea, sequence and the use of context clues to gain meaning. Graphic organizers (e.g. VENN diagrams) are taught to help students understanding content concepts.

Professional Development

Professional development is a vital part of our Standards Implementation Design Action Plan. The content of our teacher and staff workshops are aligned with our SID goals. Our school places a priority on the professional growth of our teachers. Teachers are crucial to student achievement and professional development is strongly supported by our school community.

Our SCBM Council was the first elementary school in our state, to modify the school calendar to include staff development waiver days to enable teachers and staff to grow professionally. Currently, seven days are set aside for professional development. Professional development days have been utilized in the following ways:

1. To analyze Hawaii State Assessment data and school level data.
2. To develop and modify our SID Action Plan and to evaluate the plan.
3. To align our curriculum with the Hawaii Performance and Content Standards.
4. To learn research-based effective strategies to address our diverse student needs.
5. To develop performance expectations and rubrics which address standards.
6. To identify and select curricular materials aligned to the standards.
7. To provide articulation and collaboration time between grade levels to develop coherent and challenging curricular units

Department of Education specialists assist our teachers. Nationally recognized trainers are contracted to work with teachers in the areas of reading, writing and integrated curriculum. The school provides funding for teachers to visit other schools to view effective instructional models. Collaboration and mutual respect permeate our staff development training days.

PART VII - ASSESSMENT RESULTS

ASSESSMENTS REFERENCED AGAINST NATIONAL NORMS: Liholiho

Grade 3 Test Stanford Achievement Test

Edition/publication year 9th Ed./1997 Publisher Harcourt Brace & Co.

Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs ☐ Scaled scores ☐ Percentiles ☒

| | 2002-2003**** | 2001-2002**** | 2000-2001*** | 1999-2000** | 1998-1999* |
|----------------------------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|---------------|---------------|
| Testing month | March | April | Teacher Strike | May | April |
| SCHOOL SCORES | N/A HSA | N/A HSA | NONE | Reading Comp. | Reading Comp. |
| Total Score | N/A HSA | N/A HSA | NONE | 57.61 | 45.32 |
| Number of students tested | | | 0 | 54 | 56 |
| Percent of total students tested | | | | 98.18 | 91.80 |
| Number of students excluded | | | | 1 | 5 |
| Percent of students excluded | | | | 1.82 | 8.2 |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | N/A HSA | N/A HSA | NONE | | |
| 1. Asian/Pacific Islander | | | | 57.57 | 43.28 |
| Number of students tested | | | | 49 | 50 |
| | | | | | |
| STATE SCORES | N/A HSA | N/A HSA | NONE | | |
| State Mean Score | | | | 50.35 | 44.49 |

* The State used the Stanford Achievement Test 9th Edition (1997) during school year 1998-1999 for the large scale assessment

** The State used the abbreviated Stanford Achievement Test 9th Edition (1997) during school year 1999-2000 for the large scale assessment

*** There was a state wide teacher strike during the school year 2000-2001 which precluded any administration of the state large scale assessment to our students.

****The Hawaii State Assessment ("HSA"), a standards based assessment, was given as the large scale assessment during the 2001-2002 and the 2002-2003 school years. This standards based assessment has no applicable norm-referenced scores and portions of the HSA cannot be used psychometrically to equate to the norm-referenced Stanford Achievement Test.

If the reports use scaled scores, provide the national score (mean score) and standard deviation for the total test and each subtest.

| | 2002-2003 | 2001-2002 | 2000-2001 | 1999-2000** | 1998-1999* |
|------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-------------|------------|
| NATIONAL MEAN SCORE | N/A HSA | N/A HSA | NONE | 50 | 50 |
| NATIONAL STANDARD DEVIATION | N/A HSA | N/A HSA | NONE | N/A | N/A |

ASSESSMENTS REFERENCED AGAINST NATIONAL NORMS: Liholiho

Grade 3 Test Stanford Achievement Test

Edition/publication year 9th Ed./1997 Publisher Harcourt Brace & Co.

Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs Scaled scores Percentiles x

| | 2002-2003**** | 2001-2002**** | 2000-2001*** | 1999-2000** | 1998-1999* |
|----------------------------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|-------------|------------|
| Testing month | March | April | Tchr Strike | May | April |
| SCHOOL SCORES | N/A HSA | N/A HSA | NONE | Math | Math |
| Total Score | N/A HSA | N/A HSA | NONE | 68.76 | 56.80 |
| Number of students tested | | | 0 | 54 | 56 |
| Percent of total students tested | | | | 98.18 | 91.80 |
| Number of students excluded | | | | 1 | 5 |
| Percent of students excluded | | | | 1.82 | 8.2 |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | N/A HSA | N/A HSA | NONE | | |
| 1.Asian/Pacific Islander | | | | 68.51 | 55.88 |
| Number of students tested | | | | 49 | 50 |
| | | | | | |
| STATE SCORES | N/A HSA | N/A HSA | NONE | | |
| State Mean Score | | | | 54.72 | 48.16 |

* The State used the Stanford Achievement Test 9th Edition (1997) during school year 1998-1999 for the large scale assessment

** The State used the abbreviated Stanford Achievement Test 9th Edition (1997) during school year 1999-2000 for the large scale assessment

*** There was a state wide teacher strike during the school year 2000-2001 which precluded any administration of the state large scale assessment to our students

****The Hawaii State Assessment ("HSA"), a standards based assessment, was given as the large scale assessment during the 2001-2002 and the 2002-2003 school years. This standards based assessment has no applicable norm-referenced scores and portions of the HSA cannot be used psychometrically to equate to the norm -referenced Stanford Achievement Test.

If the reports use scaled scores, provide the national score (mean score) and standard deviation for the total test and each subtest.

| | 2002-2003 | 2001-2002 | 2000-2001 | 1999-2000** | 1998-1999* |
|------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-------------|------------|
| NATIONAL MEAN SCORE | N/A HSA | N/A HSA | NONE | 50 | 50 |
| NATIONAL STANDARD DEVIATION | N/A HSA | N/A HSA | NONE | N/A | N/A |

ASSESSMENTS REFERENCED AGAINST NATIONAL NORMS: Liholiho

Grade 5 Test Stanford Achievement Test

Edition/publication year 9th Ed./1997 Publisher Harcourt Brace & Co.

Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs ☐ Scaled scores ☐ Percentiles ☒

| | 2002-2003**** | 2001-2002**** | 2000-2001*** | 1999-2000** | 1998-1999* |
|----------------------------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|
| Testing month | March | April | Tchr Strike | May | April |
| SCHOOL SCORES | N/A HSA | N/A HSA | NONE | Reading Comp. | Reading Comp. |
| Total Score | N/A HSA | N/A HSA | NONE | 55.08 | 58.84 |
| Number of students tested | | | 0 | 53 | 56 |
| Percent of total students tested | | | | 100 | 91.80 |
| Number of students excluded | | | | 0 | 5 |
| Percent of students excluded | | | | 0 | 8.2 |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | N/A HSA | N/A HSA | NONE | | |
| 1.Asian/Pacific Islander | | | | 53.30 | 57.30 |
| Number of students tested | | | | 47 | 53 |
| | | | | | |
| STATE SCORES | N/A HSA | N/A HSA | NONE | | |
| State Mean Score | | | | 49.50 | 46.74 |

* The State used the Stanford Achievement Test 9th Edition (1997) during school year 1998-1999 for the large scale assessment

** The State used the abbreviated Stanford Achievement Test 9th Edition (1997) during school year 1999-2000 for the large scale assessment

*** There was a state wide teacher strike during the school year 2000-2001 which precluded any administration of the state large scale assessment to our students

****The Hawaii State Assessment ("HSA"), a standards based assessment, was given as the large scale assessment during the 2001-2002 and the 2002-2003 school years. This standards based assessment has no applicable norm-referenced scores and portions of the HSA cannot be used psychometrically to equate to the norm-referenced Stanford Achievement Test.

If the reports use scaled scores, provide the national score (mean score) and standard deviation for the total test and each subtest.

| | 2002-2003 | 2001-2002 | 2000-2001 | 1999-2000** | 1998-1999* |
|------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-------------|------------|
| NATIONAL MEAN SCORE | N/A HSA | N/A HSA | NONE | 50 | 50 |
| NATIONAL STANDARD DEVIATION | N/A HSA | N/A HSA | NONE | N/A | N/A |

ASSESSMENTS REFERENCED AGAINST NATIONAL NORMS: Liholiho

Grade 5 Test Stanford Achievement Test

Edition/publication year 9th Ed./1997 Publisher Harcourt Brace & Co.

Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs ☐ Scaled scores ☐ Percentiles ☒

| | 2002-2003**** | 2001-2002**** | 2000-2001*** | 1999-2000** | 1998-1999* |
|----------------------------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|-------------|------------|
| Testing month | March | April | Tchr Strike | May | April |
| SCHOOL SCORES | N/A HSA | N/A HSA | NONE | Math | Math |
| Total Score | N/A HSA | N/A HSA | NONE | 69.17 | 70.43 |
| Number of students tested | | | 0 | 53 | 56 |
| Percent of total students tested | | | | 100 | 91.80 |
| Number of students excluded | | | | 0 | 5 |
| Percent of students excluded | | | | 0 | 8.2 |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | N/A HSA | N/A HSA | NONE | | |
| 1.Asian/Pacific Islander | | | | 70.70 | 69.60 |
| Number of students tested | | | | 47 | 53 |
| | | | | | |
| STATE SCORES | N/A HSA | N/A HSA | NONE | | |
| State Mean Score | | | | 55.53 | 50.83 |

* The State used the Stanford Achievement Test 9th Edition (1997) during school year 1998-1999 for the large scale assessment

** The State used the abbreviated Stanford Achievement Test 9th Edition (1997) during school year 1999-2000 for the large scale assessment

*** There was a state wide teacher strike during the school year 2000-2001 which precluded any administration of the state large scale assessment to our students

****The Hawaii State Assessment ("HSA"), a standards based assessment, was given as the large scale assessment during the 2001-2002 and the 2002-2003 school years. This standards based assessment has no applicable norm-referenced scores and portions of the HSA cannot be used psychometrically to equate to the norm -referenced Stanford Achievement Test.

If the reports use scaled scores, provide the national score (mean score) and standard deviation for the total test and each subtest.

| | 2002-2003 | 2001-2002 | 2000-2001 | 1999-2000** | 1998-1999* |
|------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-------------|------------|
| NATIONAL MEAN SCORE | N/A HSA | N/A HSA | NONE | 50 | 50 |
| NATIONAL STANDARD DEVIATION | N/A HSA | N/A HSA | NONE | N.A | N.A. |

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS: Liholiho

Grade 3

Test Hawaii State Assessment

Edition/publication year 1st/2001

Publisher Hawaii Department of Education

| | 2002-2003**** | 2001-2002**** | 2000-2001*** | 1999-2000** | 1998-1999* |
|---|---------------|---------------|--------------|-------------|------------|
| Testing month | March | April | Tchr Strike | May | April |
| SCHOOL SCORES | Reading | Reading | NONE | N/A | N/A |
| % At or above Well Below Proficiency | 100 | 100 | | | |
| % At or above Approaches Proficiency | 98.2 | 85.1 | | | |
| % At or above Meets Proficiency | 53.6 | 37.3 | | | |
| % At or above Exceeds Proficiency | 0.0 | 1.5 | | | |
| Number of students tested | 56 | 67 | 0 | | |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 100 | | | |
| Number of students excluded | 0 | 0 | | | |
| Percent of students excluded | 0 | 0 | | | |
| | | | | | |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1. <u>Asian/Pacific Islander</u> (specify subgroup) | | | NONE | N/A | N/A |
| % At or above Well Below Proficiency | 100 | 100 | | | |
| % At or above Approaches Proficiency | 96.2 | 85.7 | | | |
| % At or above Meets Proficiency | 52.8 | 39.7 | | | |
| % At or above Exceeds Proficiency | 0 | 1.6 | | | |
| Number of students tested | 53 | 63 | | | |
| | | | | | |
| STATE SCORES | | | NONE | N/A | N/A |
| % At or above Well Below Proficiency | 100 | 100 | | | |
| State scaled mean score | 172.35 | 171.09 | | | |
| % At or above Approaches Proficiency | 90.3 | 91 | | | |
| State scaled mean score | 256.16 | 254.29 | | | |
| % At or above Meets Proficiency | 42.8 | 43.4 | | | |
| State scaled mean score | 340.27 | 337.82 | | | |
| % At or above Exceeds Proficiency | 1.2 | 2.1 | | | |
| State scaled mean score | 448.92 | 436.62 | | | |

* The State used the Stanford Achievement Test 9th Edition (1997) during school year 1998-1999 for the large scale assessment. The SAT9 is not a criterion referenced test and we cannot psychometrically compare the SAT9 to the current Hawaii State Assessment (HSA).

** The State used the abbreviated Stanford Achievement Test 9th Edition (1997) during school year 1999-2000 for the large scale assessment. The abbreviated SAT9 is not a criterion referenced test and we cannot psychometrically compare the abbreviated SAT9 to the current HSA.

*** There was a state wide teacher strike during the school year 2000-2001 which precluded any administration of the state large scale assessment to our students

****The Hawaii State Assessment (2001), a standards based assessment, was given as the large scale assessment during the 2001-2002 and the 2002-2003 school years. This standards based assessment has no applicable norm-referenced scores and portions of the criterion referenced HSA cannot be used psychometrically to equate to the norm-referenced Stanford Achievement Tests.

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS: Liholiho

Grade 3

Test Hawaii State Assessment

Edition/publication year 1st/2001

Publisher Hawaii Department of Education

| | 2002-2003**** | 2001-2002**** | 2000-2001*** | 1999-2000** | 1998-1999* |
|---|---------------|---------------|--------------|-------------|------------|
| Testing month | March | April | Tchr Strike | May | April |
| SCHOOL SCORES | Math | Math | NONE | N/A | N/A |
| % At or above Well Below Proficiency | 100 | 100 | | | |
| % At or above Approaches Proficiency | 91.4 | 75.4 | | | |
| % At or above Meets Proficiency | 32.8 | 12.3 | | | |
| % At or above Exceeds Proficiency | 5.2 | 3.1 | | | |
| Number of students tested | 56 | 65 | | | |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 97.01 | | | |
| Number of students excluded | 0 | 2 | | | |
| Percent of students excluded | 0 | 2.99 | | | |
| | | | | | |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1. <u>Asian/Pacific Islander</u> (specify subgroup) | | | NONE | N/A | N/A |
| % At or above Well Below Proficiency | 100 | 100 | | | |
| % At or above Approaches Proficiency | 94.4 | 74.6 | | | |
| % At or above Meets Proficiency | 34 | 12.7 | | | |
| % At or above Exceeds Proficiency | 5.7 | 3.2 | | | |
| Number of students tested | 53 | 63 | | | |
| | | | | | |
| STATE SCORES | | | NONE | N/A | N/A |
| % At or above Well Below Proficiency | 100 | 100 | | | |
| State scaled mean score | 159.43 | 159.99 | | | |
| % At or above Approaches Proficiency | 81.1 | 77.9 | | | |
| State scaled mean score | 252.78 | 249.67 | | | |
| % At or above Meets Proficiency | 24.4 | 20.4 | | | |
| State scaled mean score | 326.77 | 323.07 | | | |
| % At or above Exceeds Proficiency | 2.2 | 1.6 | | | |
| State scaled mean score | 395.29 | 387.38 | | | |

* The State used the Stanford Achievement Test 9th Edition (1997) during school year 1998-1999 for the large scale assessment. The SAT9 is not a criterion referenced test and we cannot psychometrically compare the SAT9 to the current Hawaii State Assessment (HSA).

** The State used the abbreviated Stanford Achievement Test 9th Edition (1997) during school year 1999-2000 for the large scale assessment. The abbreviated SAT9 is not a criterion referenced test and we cannot psychometrically compare the abbreviated SAT9 to the current HSA.

*** There was a state wide teacher strike during the school year 2000-2001 which precluded any administration of the state large scale assessment to our students

****The Hawaii State Assessment (2001), a standards based assessment, was given as the large scale assessment during the 2001-2002 and the 2002-2003 school years. This standards based assessment has no applicable norm-referenced scores and portions of the criterion referenced HSA cannot be used psychometrically to equate to the norm-referenced Stanford Achievement Tests.

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS: Liholiho

Grade 5

Test Hawaii State Assessment

Edition/publication year 1st/2001

Publisher Hawaii Department of Education

| | 2002-2003**** | 2001-2002**** | 2000-2001*** | 1999-2000** | 1998-1999* |
|---|---------------|---------------|--------------|-------------|------------|
| Testing month | March | April | Tchr Strike | May | April |
| SCHOOL SCORES | Reading | Reading | NONE | N/A | N/A |
| % At or above Well Below Proficiency | 100 | 100 | | | |
| % At or above Approaches Proficiency | 96.1 | 86 | | | |
| % At or above Meets Proficiency | 76.9 | 68 | | | |
| % At or above Exceeds Proficiency | 0 | 2 | | | |
| Number of students tested | 52 | 50 | | | |
| Percent of total students tested | 96.30 | 98.04 | | | |
| Number of students excluded | 2 | 1 | | | |
| Percent of students excluded | 3.70 | 1.96 | | | |
| | | | | | |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1. <u>Asian/Pacific Islander</u> (specify subgroup) | | | NONE | N/A | N/A |
| % At or above Well Below Proficiency | 100 | 100 | | | |
| % At or above Approaches Proficiency | 95.7 | 87 | | | |
| % At or above Meets Proficiency | 76.6 | 69.6 | | | |
| % At or above Exceeds Proficiency | 0 | 2.2 | | | |
| Number of students tested | 47 | 46 | | | |
| | | | | | |
| STATE SCORES | | | NONE | N/A | N/A |
| % At or above Well Below Proficiency | 100 | 100 | | | |
| State scaled mean score | 179.61 | 168.36 | | | |
| % At or above Approaches Proficiency | 84.8 | 87.6 | | | |
| State scaled mean score | 257.72 | 253.60 | | | |
| % At or above Meets Proficiency | 41.6 | 42.3 | | | |
| State scaled mean score | 343.80 | 337.97 | | | |
| % At or above Exceeds Proficiency | 1.1 | 1.3 | | | |
| State scaled mean score | 455.91 | 448.35 | | | |

* The State used the Stanford Achievement Test 9th Edition (1997) during school year 1998-1999 for the large scale assessment. The SAT9 is not a criterion referenced test and we cannot psychometrically compare the SAT9 to the current Hawaii State Assessment (HSA).

** The State used the abbreviated Stanford Achievement Test 9th Edition (1997) during school year 1999-2000 for the large scale assessment. The abbreviated SAT9 is not a criterion referenced test and we cannot psychometrically compare the abbreviated SAT9 to the current HSA.

*** There was a state wide teacher strike during the school year 2000-2001 which precluded any administration of the state large scale assessment to our students

****The Hawaii State Assessment (2001), a standards based assessment, was given as the large scale assessment during the 2001-2002 and the 2002-2003 school years. This standards based assessment has no applicable norm-referenced scores and portions of the criterion referenced HSA cannot be used psychometrically to equate to the norm-referenced Stanford Achievement Tests.

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TEST: Liholiho

Grade 5

Test Hawaii State Assessment

Edition/publication year 1st/2001

Publisher Hawaii Department of Education

| | 2002-2003**** | 2001-2002**** | 2000-2001*** | 1999-2000** | 1998-1999* |
|---|---------------|---------------|--------------|-------------|------------|
| Testing month | March | April | Tchr Strike | May | April |
| SCHOOL SCORES | Math | Math | NONE | N/A | N/A |
| % At or above Well Below Proficiency | 100 | 100 | | | |
| % At or above Approaches Proficiency | 92.3 | 90.3 | | | |
| % At or above Meets Proficiency | 42.3 | 33.4 | | | |
| % At or above Exceeds Proficiency | 0 | 2 | | | |
| Number of students tested | 52 | 51 | | | |
| Percent of total students tested | 96.30 | 100 | | | |
| Number of students excluded | 2 | 0 | | | |
| Percent of students excluded | 3.70 | 0 | | | |
| | | | | | |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1. <u>Asian/Pacific Islander</u> (specify subgroup) | | | NONE | N/A | N/A |
| % At or above Well Below Proficiency | 100 | 100 | | | |
| % At or above Approaches Proficiency | 93.6 | 93.5 | | | |
| % At or above Meets Proficiency | 40.4 | 30.5 | | | |
| % At or above Exceeds Proficiency | 0 | 2.2 | | | |
| Number of students tested | 47 | 46 | | | |
| | | | | | |
| STATE SCORES | | | | | |
| % At or above Well Below Proficiency | 100 | 100 | | | |
| State scaled mean score | 168.24 | 160.36 | | | |
| % At or above Approaches Proficiency | 76.3 | 75 | | | |
| State scaled mean score | 251.77 | 248.79 | | | |
| % At or above Meets Proficiency | 19.8 | 21.1 | | | |
| State scaled mean score | 329.37 | 325.90 | | | |
| % At or above Exceeds Proficiency | 1.4 | 1.8 | | | |
| State scaled mean score | 414.60 | 403.43 | | | |

* The State used the Stanford Achievement Test 9th Edition (1997) during school year 1998-1999 for the large scale assessment. The SAT9 is not a criterion referenced test and we cannot psychometrically compare the SAT9 to the current Hawaii State Assessment (HSA).

** The State used the abbreviated Stanford Achievement Test 9th Edition (1997) during school year 1999-2000 for the large scale assessment. The abbreviated SAT9 is not a criterion referenced test and we cannot psychometrically compare the abbreviated SAT9 to the current HSA.

*** There was a state wide teacher strike during the school year 2000-2001 which precluded any administration of the state large scale assessment to our students

****The Hawaii State Assessment (2001), a standards based assessment, was given as the large scale assessment during the 2001-2002 and the 2002-2003 school years. This standards based assessment has no applicable norm-referenced scores and portions of the criterion referenced HSA cannot be used psychometrically to equate to the norm-referenced Stanford Achievement Tests.

In 2000, the decision was made to move our statewide assessment from a norm referenced test (SAT9) to a standards based criterion referenced assessment to measure student performance in the content areas of Language Arts and Mathematics. This was based on the premise that a norm referenced exam did not reflect the uniqueness, nor the breadth and depth of the Hawaii content and performance expectations for Language Arts and Mathematics. The Hawaii State Assessment (2001) has four proficiency levels.

Level 1: **Well Below Proficiency** means that the assessment results indicate that this student has demonstrated little or no knowledge and skills for the content standard for this grade.

Level 2: **Approaches Proficiency** means that the student has demonstrated some knowledge and skills in the content standards for this grade. With more support and effort, the student should be able to reach the proficient level.

Level 3: **Meets Proficiency** means that the assessment results indicate that the student has demonstrated knowledge and skills required standards for this grade. The student is ready to work on higher levels of this content area.

Level 4: **Exceeds Proficiency** means that the assessment results indicate that the student has demonstrated knowledge and skills that exceed the content standards for this grade. The student is ready for more advanced work in the content area.

Scaled Scores based on the initial administration of the Hawaii State Assessment were developed during Spring 2002. The scale scores have been derived from the raw scores in order to create a score scale with meaningful interpretations. For instance, a 300 means that the student has met the standard. Scale Scores can be used to compare student performance across different administrations of the assessment sessions within a particular content area.